

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 7-9 and 15 are independent claims. Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 2, 4-6, 10, and 12-14 contain allowable subject matter.

Entry of the Remarks is respectfully requested to place the present application in condition for allowance, or in the alternative, better form for appeal. In view of the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,121,950 issued to Zavracky, *et al.* (“Zavracky”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection improper.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an image display comprising:

a plurality of first electrodes individually formed corresponding to the pixels, a second electrode formed in common with the first electrodes, a plurality of light emitting elements provided between the first electrode and the second electrode and including a light emitting layer, and a plurality of transistors provided corresponding to the pixels and connected between the first electrodes and a power supply voltage line for controlling the current supply to the EL elements; . . .

a display controller for using a current value fed back from the second electrode of the display panel; . . . (emphasis added).

Zavracky does not teach such features. Rather, Zavracky is directed towards a “control apparatus for an active matrix liquid crystal display device.” See Zavracky, Abstract (emphasis added). Thus, contrary to Examiner’s assertion in the Office Action, Zavracky does not teach a plurality of light emitting elements, each with a light emitting layer, between the first electrodes and the common second electrode. The only light source discussed in Zavracky is in Column 1, line 31, in which LCDs are described as able to include a “white light source.” However, the arrangement of the white light source is never disclosed, and Zavracky neither shows in the Figures nor describes in the specification light emitting elements, each with a light emitting layer, positioned between the first electrodes and the common second electrode. Instead, Zavracky shows incident light 1101 which enters the LCD device from outside the light polarizers 1095 in Fig. 6B, Fig. 6C, and Fig. 8.

Similarly, Zavracky does not disclose “current supply to the EL elements.” As noted above, Zavracky is directed to an LCD device, which does not include EL elements.

Finally, Zavracky does not disclose “using a current value fed back from the second electrode of the display panel.” Rather, in Zavracky, feedback signals are provided to a video polarity network from “at least one temperature sensor 92 and at least one light sensor 94.” See Zavracky, col. 13, lines 24-25. Further, Zavracky does not teach or disclose any connection of a temperature sensor or a light sensor to a common second electrode of the display panel. Even where a temperature sensor or light sensor is physically positioned in the vicinity of a second electrode, current from a temperature sensor or light sensor does not anticipate “a current value fed back from the second electrode” (emphasis added).

In the previous Reply and Amendment filed by Applicants on February 10, 2006, “using a current value fed back by the second electrode” was amended to “using a current value fed back from the second electrode.” Further, Examiner asserts in the Advisory Action that this amendment does not overcome the prior art rejection. However, Applicants believe that Examiner has not fully considered this change to the claim since Examiner has not been able to point to location in Zavracky where current is fed back from the second electrode. Specifically, as asserted above, the feedback signal taught by Zavracky comes from a light sensor or temperature sensor, but not from a second electrode.

Additionally, while Zavracky teaches feedback signals from the temperature sensor 92 or light sensor 94, Zavracky does not teach these feedback signals as “current value.” In fact, these feedback signals are not described in any more detail. However, Zavracky describes signals in Col. 16, line 60 to Col. 17, line 2, where signals are taught to be voltage signals rather than current values. Accordingly, this provides strong evidence that Zavracky’s feedback signals are limited to voltage signals and not current values.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Zavracky does not teach a “current value fed back from the second electrode of the display panel.”

Claims 7-9 and 15 contain similar limitations as claim 1. Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*, “a plurality of light emitting elements provided between the first electrode and the second electrode and including a light emitting layer,” “current supply to the EL elements,” and “current value fed back from at least one second electrode.” Claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, “current value fed back from the second electrode.” Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*, “current value fed back from an electrode of the display panel.” Claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, “current value fed back from an electrode of a

display panel.” As asserted above regarding claim 1, these limitations are not taught by Zavracky.

Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 7- 9 and 15, and all the claims that depend therefrom are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11 and 15.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 2, 4-6, 10, and 12-14 contain allowable subject matter.


**CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: March 29, 2006

**CUSTOMER NO. 58027**  
H.C. Park & Associates, PLC  
8500 Leesburg Pike  
Suite 7500  
Vienna, VA 22182  
Tel: 703-288-5105  
Fax: 703-288-5139  
HCP/WMH/alj